

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claim 14 is added by the present response. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,678,068 to Richter et al. (herein "Richter").

Addressing the above-noted rejection based on Richter, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over the teachings in Richter.

Independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to further recite that "different processes" that the image data is undergoing at any given moment are displayed, and the display includes a plurality of components "corresponding to the different processes and that are displayed simultaneously on a display portion". That subject matter is believed to be fully supported by the original specification for example in Figure 2 showing the various display components 31-39 corresponding to different processes that the image data is undergoing at any given moment, and that are simultaneously displayed.

The applicants of the present invention recognized that in the conventional art of printing apparatus the status of print jobs has not always been displayed clearly enough so that a user can be comfortable in determining, when a printing operation is being delayed, whether the printing apparatus is merely taking a long time or a problem has occurred and printing has been stopped.¹ Thus, one object of the present invention is to provide a printing apparatus with enhanced displays so that a user can have a better understanding of the progress of printing jobs. One manner in which the present invention achieves such an objective is to include plural display components corresponding to different processes the image data is undergoing at any given moment, and that can be simultaneously displayed on a display portion. As shown for example in Figure 2 in the present specification the various

¹ See for example the present specification at page 3, lines 3-13.

display components 31-39 provide displays such as a spooling indicator 31, a spool data display 36, a drawing indicator 33, a drawing page data display 34, a saved job data display 35, a printed page data display 36, a printing indicator 37, a supply/exit tray data indicator 38, and a message display 39, all as non-limiting examples of different types of display components of the different processes the image data is undergoing at any moment, and that can be simultaneously displayed.² Several of the dependent claims recite such individual display components.

Applicants respectfully submit the claimed features of including such plural display components that can be simultaneously displayed on a display portion are neither taught nor suggested by Richter.

With respect to the claimed “display means” the outstanding rejection cites Richter at Figures 7-20 and column 11, lines 46-58, and column 10, line 48 – column 11, line 6, and particularly notes that Richter “shows that a display is used to display messages concerning the state of an image file such as ‘spooling’, ‘waiting to rip’, ‘ripping’, ‘waiting to print’, and ‘printing’ which sufficiently cover at any given moment which process image data is undergoing”.³

However, in that respect applicants note that in the various figures of Richter, such as Figures 12-20, Richter discloses only displaying one of such messages at a time. Richter also discloses at column 11, line 51 et seq. different possible states of the file message 142. But again in that portion Richter appears to indicate that such messages are only individually displayed as the printing progresses.

² See the Specification at page 14, lines 3-9.

³ Office Action of November 2, 2005, middle of page 4.

Further, with respect to the disclosure in Richter at column 10, line 48 to column 11, line 6, that disclosure was apparently cited with respect to the different toggles that were displayed simultaneously. However, applicants note those toggles do not display a process that the image data is undergoing at any given moment, but instead only allow ways for a user to make a selection.

The claims are directed to a different structure than in Richter. More specifically, in the claims as currently written the display means includes “a plurality of display components corresponding to the different processes and that are displayed simultaneously on a display portion”. As noted above, with such claimed feature, and as shown for example in Figure 2, different display portions 31-39 showing different processes that the image data is undergoing at any given moment can be simultaneously displayed. Such a structure allows an enhanced and easy to understand display so that a user can be more up-to-date on the status of various job operations. Richter does not disclose or suggest such features.

In maintaining the outstanding rejection, the outstanding Office Action references the plurality of toggles in Figure 7-20 of Richter, and also references Figure 27 of Richter showing that the status of the spool, rip, and print processes can be displayed simultaneously.⁴

In response to that basis of the outstanding rejection, applicants again note that in Figures 7-20 the various toggles shown in Richter do not correspond to different processes that the image data is undergoing at any given moment, but again merely correspond to different selections available for a user. That structure in Richter does not provide any benefit to providing a user with a more up-to-date status of the various job operations.

Further, Figure 27 in Richter merely provides different queues that show jobs in the queues, but does not provide any indication of the different processes that the image data is

⁴ Office Action of November 2, 2005, page 2, bottom paragraph.

undergoing at any given moment. As noted above, the claims are directed to allowing the different processes that an image data is currently undergoing to be easily shown to a user. The mere listing of a job in the queue as in Figure 27 in Richter is not directed to such a feature.

In maintaining the outstanding rejection, the outstanding Office Action also states:

Particularly, the applicant states that the current invention displays the processing that image data is undergoing at any given moment simultaneously so as to display multiple processes of a plurality of image data simultaneously. However, the claim limitation only recites that a plurality of display components are displayed simultaneously, which is not the same as the argument presented by the applicant.⁵

In reply, applicants clarify that applicants' comments were and are directed to displaying for a specific image data the different processes that specific image data is undergoing at any given moment, and providing different display components corresponding to those different processes, and that are simultaneously displayed. The presently submitted claim language is believed to clarify such features, which as discussed above are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Richter.

New independent claim 14 recites similar limitations as discussed above, and is therefore believed to be allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written distinguish over Richter.

⁵ Office Action of November 2, 2005, page 3, prenumbered paragraph 3.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/SS:aif

I:\ATTYSNS\21's\214892\214892US-AM1.DOC